

No. S. E. Rohtak Circle/PWD/B&R/No. 28RA/6/457.—Notification by Government in Gazette under section 6 Act, I, 1894 whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is required to be taken by Government, on the public expense, for a public purpose, namely, "Constructing Nangal Chaudhry Budhwal road to village Budhwal in Mohindergarh District." It is hereby declared that the Land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This declaration is made under the provision of section 6 of Land Acquisition Act I, 1894, to all whom it may concern and the provisions of section 7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt. is hereby directed to take order of the acquisition of the said land.

Plans of the land may be inspected in the offices of the Land Acquisition Collector Haryana Public Works Department Buildings and Roads Branch Ambala Cantt., and Executive Engineer, Construction Division, Public Works Department Buildings and Roads Branch, Narnaul.

Serial No.	District	Tehsil	Village	Area in acres	Remarks
1	Mohindergarh	Narnaul	Budhwal	1.28	- Khasra No. 77 Consolidation path. Net to be acquired land Nil Consoli- dation path 1.28 Acres

No. S.E. Rohtak Circle/P.W.D./B&R/Br./Rohtak/No. 28 RA/4/458.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be required to be taken by Government, at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, constructing Narnaul Nangal Chaudhry road to village Mohbatpur Bhungarka including link to village Simli Ismailpur in Mohindergarh District, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested who has any objection to the acquisition of any land in the locality may within thirty days of the publication of this notification, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt.

SPECIFICATION

Serial No.	District	Tehsil	Locality	Area in acres	Remarks
1	Mohindergarh	Narnaul	Akbarpur Sirohi	6.36	Mustil No. 20 Killa No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6/1, 6/2, 7, 8, 9, 10 Mustatil No. 21 Killa No. 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10 Kahara No. 36, 64, 65, 70, 95, 96, 97, 98, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 103, 213

Serial No.	District	Tehsil	Locality	Area in acres	Remarks
		Mohbatpur Bhungarkha		4.34	Mustatil No. 6 Killa No. 17, 18, 24, 25
					Mustatil No. 23
					Killa No. 21/1, 21/2, 22
					Mustatil No. 24
					Killa No. 1/1, 1/2, 2, 8, 9/1, 9/2; 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 25
					Mustatil No. 25
					Killa No. 5/1, 5/2,
					Mustatil No. 30.
					Killa No. 1, 2/1, 2/2, 3/1, 3/2, 7/1, 7/2, 8/9/1, 14, 15, 16
					Mustatil No. 31
					Killa No. 19, 20/1, 20/2, 21, 22/1, 22/2, 23, -- 11 --
					Mustatil No. 45
					Killa No. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 15/1, 15/2,
					Kashara No. 124, 145, 934, 935, 933
					Mutatil No. 7
					Killa No. 21
		Simali Ismailpur		1.00	Mustatil No. 15
					Killa No. 4, 5
					Mustatil No. 16
					Killa No. 1, 2, 3, 9, 10
					Kashara No. 34, 35, 37, 46, 62, 63
		Total		11.70 Acres	

The 10th October, 1977

No. S.E. Rohtak Circle/PWD/B&R/No. 28RA/6/459.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is required to be taken by Government on the Public expense for a public purpose namely, constructing Ateli Kheri road to Kheri in Mohindergarh District, it is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This declaration is made under the provision of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act I, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provisions of section 7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt. is hereby directed to take over the acquisition of the said land.

Plans of the land may be inspected in the offices of the Land Acquisition Collector Haryana Public Works Department Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt., and Executive Engineer, Construction Division, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch Narnaul.

Serial No.	District	Tehsil	Village	Acres in Acres	Remarks
1	Mohindergarh	Narnaul	Kheri Acquired land Consolidation path	1.14 Nil 1.14	252

The 13th October, 1977

No. SE/Rohtak Circle/PWD/B&R/No. 28RA/6/461.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is required to be taken by Government, on the public expense, for a public purpose, namely, constructing Narnaul-Dhulera road to village Khawazpur in Mohindergarh District, it is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This declaration is made under the provision of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act I, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provisions of section 7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition collector, Haryana, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt., is hereby directed to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

Plans of the land may be inspected in the offices of the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala, Cantt., and Executive Engineer, Construction Division, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, Narnaul.

Serial No.	District	Tehsil	Village	Area in Acres	Remarks
1	Mohindergarh	Narnaul	Khawazpur	1.08	Mustatil No. 19 Killa No. 23/2, Mustatil No. 23, Killa No. 1/1, 1/2, 9/2, 9/1, 9/3, 10, 13/1, 26, Mustatil No. 24 Killa No. 3, 4/1, 4/2, 5, 6, Khasara No. 49, 99, 100, 101, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87

(Sd.) . . . ,

Superintending Engineer,
Rohtak Circle, P. W. D., B. & R. Branch.

Circle Ambala

The 13th October, 1977

No. SE/PWD/B&R/Ambala/1033.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be needed by the Government, at public expense, for a public purpose, constructing of a road S. B. K. road to village Bhudian, tehsil Ambala, district Ambala, it is hereby notified that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to authorise the officers, for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested in the above land, who has any objection to the acquisition thereof, may within thirty days after the date on which public notice of the substance of this notification is given in the locality, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, Public Works Department Buildings and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality/ Village	Habdist No.	Area in Acres	Khasra No.	Remarks
Ambala	Ambala	Bhudian	151	3.61	647, 679, 680, 681, 682, 677, 700, 701/1, 701/2, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708/1, 708/2, 709/1, 709/2, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 722, 723, 724, 725, 730, 731, 728, 729, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024	

(Sd.)

Superintending Engineer,
Ambala Circle, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch,
Ambala Cantt.

राजस्व विभाग

युद्ध जागीर

दिनांक 13 अक्टूबर, 1977

क्रमांक 1724-ज(I)-76/25967.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उसमें आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए) (1) तथा 3(1) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री चन्दा राम, पुत्र श्री गंगा सहाय, गंव विठ्ठन, तहसील लौहारू, ज़िला भिवानी, को रखी, 1965 से रखी, 1970 तक 100 रुपये वार्षिक तथा खरीफ, 1970 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

क्रमांक 1667-ज(I)-77/25975.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उसमें आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2 (ए) (1) तथा 3 (1) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर उनके सामने दी गई फसल तथा राशि एवं सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं:—

क्रमांक	ज़िला	जागीर पाने वाले का नाम	गंव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	वार्षिक राशि
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	भिवानी	श्री बदन सिंह, पुत्र श्री भैरू सिंह	हेतमपुरा	भिवानी	खरी, 1974 से	रुपये 150

क्रमांक	जिला	जागीर पाने वाने का नाम गांव व पता	तहसील	फसल/वर्ष जब से जागीर दी गई	वार्षिक राशि	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	भिवानी	श्री हीरा राम, पुत्र श्री मुन्ना राम	नांगल	लौहारू	रबी, 1975 से	150 रुपये
3	,	श्री राम करण, पुत्र श्री चेत राम	गोठडा	"	खरीफ, 1964 से रबी, 1970 तक	100
4	,	श्री चन्दगी राम, पुत्र श्री बाला राम	सरिडा जदीद	"	खरीफ, 1970 से खरीफ, 1964 से रबी, 1970 तक	150 100 खरीफ, 1970 से
						150

क्रमांक 1605-ज(J)-77/25979.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उसमें आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए)(1) तथा 3(1) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री तोता राम, पुत्र श्री श्रीराम, गांव मन्दोली, तहसील लोहारू, जिला भिवानी को रबी, 1966 से रबी, 1970 तक 100 रुपये वार्षिक तथा खरीफ, 1970 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

क्रमांक 1468-ज(I)-77/25983.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उस में आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए)(1) तथा 3(1) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री राम स्वरूप, पुत्र श्री पीरदान, गांव अटेलाखुर्द, तहसील दादरी, जिला भिवानी, को खरीफ, 1967 से रबी, 1970 तक 100 रुपये वार्षिक, खरीफ, 1970 से खरीफ, 1972 तक 150 रुपये वार्षिक तथा रबी, 1973 से 200 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सनद से दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

यशवन्त कुमार जैन,
विशेष कार्य अधिकारी, हरियाणा सरकार,
राजस्व विभाग।

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 11th October, 1977

No. 10558-4 Lab-77/27264.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Hira Metal Industries, Jagadhri.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK
Reference No. 87 of 1976

between

SHRI LOTTI RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HIRA METAL INDUSTRIES, JAGADHRI

AWARD

By order No. ID/AMB/513-A-76/39763 dated 20th October, 1976, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Hira Metal Industries Jagadhri and its

workman Shri Lotti Ram to this Court for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether termination of services of Shri Lotti Ram, was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings giving rise to the following issues framed,—*vide* order dated 18th January, 1977;—

- (1) Whether Shri Lotti Ram was employed as a workman with the management concerned?
- (2) If yes, whether the termination of service of Shri Lotti Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The workman could not adduce any evidence in support of issue No. 1 despite four opportunities given to him in that behalf or much so, he did not personally appear on any of the hearing fixed for 23-11-76, 18-1-77, 8-3-77, 24-5-77, 25-5-77, 28-6-77, 28-7-77, and 28-9-77 inability of the workman concerned to adduce any evidence in proof of issue No. 1 despite opportunities granted to him,—*vide* orders dated 18-1-77, 8-3-77, 25-5-77, 28-6-77 and 28-7-77 led to a conclusion beyond doubt that he had nothing to say and was otherwise not interested in pursuing the demand raised by him on the management leading to this reference. His evidence had thus to be closed in circumstances of the case stated above,—*vide* order dated 28th September, 1977.

In absence of any evidence on record for Shri Lotti Ram that he was employed as a workman with the management concerned, I decide issue No. 1 against him with a finding that he is not entitled to any relief as a result of the decision of this issue against him. I, accordingly answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 28th September, 1977

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 2076, dated the 30th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 10535-4Lab-77/27266.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Harbans Lal Prem Kumar (P) Ltd., 18/1, Milestone, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

References Nos. 70, 71, 72 of 1976

between

SHRI HOTI LAL, RAM NAWAL, DESH RAJ, WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
M/S. HARBANS LAL PREM KUMAR (P) LTD, 18/1, MILESTONE, MATHURA
ROAD, FARIDABAD.

Present :—

Neither party present.

AWARD

By orders Nos. ID/FD/834-C-75/10454, ID/FD/934-E-75/10460, ID/FD/834-D-75/10448, 18th March, 1976, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Harbans

Lal Prem Kumar (P) Ltd, 18/1, Milestone, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workmen Shri Hoti Lal, Ram Naval, Desh Raj, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hoti Lal, Ram Naval, Desh Raj was justified and in order? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 20th August, 1976.—

Whether the management made payment of the dues of the workman in full and final satisfaction of all his claim including that of his reinstatement?

The case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management did not turn up thereafter on the date of hearing, hence *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the management and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself and one witness Shri Ram Naval a workman. He then prayed for giving further evidence. The case was then fixed for remaining *ex parte* evidence of the workman. Then the workman prayed for adjournment which was granted. On next date of hearing the representative for the workman was reported to be busy in Election so he did not appear on 8th March, 1977. Then the case was fixed for the remaining evidence of the workman on 25th April, 1977. On 25th April, 1977 another workman came and requested for adjournment stating that the representative of the workman was out of station, which was granted. Then on 26th May, 1977 notice was issued to Shri Ram Murti Sharma through whom the workman is described in the order of reference. He appeared and the management did not appear. The representative of the workman then stated on 23rd June, 1977 that the workman has not met him and he prayed for one adjournment which was granted and the case was fixed for the remaining evidence of the workman on 29th July, 1977. On 29th July, 1977 none appeared. It was a case of default after granting so many adjournments to the workman. It was noticed that the workman was not taking any interest in the dispute nor his representative cared for pursuing the dispute. I am, therefore, of the view that there is no dispute between the parties and the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 8th September, 1977.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 943, dated the 27th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 27th September, 1977.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 10557-4Lab-77/27270.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Lottus Industries, Jagadhari.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 93 of 1977

between

SHRI SUBH NARAIN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. LOTTUS INDUSTRIES,
JAGADHARI

AWARD

By order No. ID/AMB/304-77/28858, dated 4th August, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Lottus Industries Jagadhari and its workman

Shri Subh Narain, to this Court for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Subh Narain was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties put in their appearance before me in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and arrived at a mutual amicable settlement reduced into writing and exhibited as W-1 whereby the workman received a sum of Rs 489 from the management concerned in full and final satisfaction of all his claims against them under the demand leading to this reference.

It would thus appear that the demand raised on the management by the applicant leading to the reference has been fully satisfied and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I, hold accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 27th September, 1977.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 2077, dated the 30th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 10529-4Lab-77/27272.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workwoman and the management of M/s Haryana Potteries and Chemicals, Udhampur, Jagadhri .

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK.

Reference No. 97 of 1975

between

SHRIMATI KALAWATI WORKWOMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA POTTERIES AND CHEMICALS, UDHAMGARH, JAGADHRI.

AWARD

By order No. ID/UMB/423-B-75/67068, dated 6th November, 1975, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Haryana Potteries and Chemicals, Udhampur, Jagadhri and its Workwoman Shrimati Kalawati, to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947;

“Whether the termination of services of Smt. Kalawati was justified and in order ? If not; to what relief is she entitled ?

The parties put in their appearance before me in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings.

The workwoman alleged, — *vide* claim statement filed by her in conformity with the notice of demand served on the management, that the latter illegally terminated her services, w.e.f. 8-5-1975 as a result of the demand of payment to her of full wages and that she was entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

The management denied the allegations of the workwoman, — *vide* written statement filed by them and pleaded that she served them intermittently only as part time labourer against a temporary vacancy during the period from 1st January, 1975 to 12th March, 1975 and that she abandoned her job voluntarily w.e.f. 12th March, 1975 and received her dues on that date in full and final satisfaction of her claim. They pleaded in the alternative that even if it were assumed as correct, that her services were terminated by them, it was a case of discharge simplicitor and that she was not entitled to any relief.

The workwoman reiterated the allegations made by her in the claim statement and controverted the pleas of the management,—*vide rejoinder* filed by her with the result that the following issues were framed by me on pleas of the parties,—*vide* my order, dated 21st September, 1976:—

1. Whether the workwoman was employed by the management as a part time labourer against a temporary vacancy, only for the period from 1st January, 1975 to 12th March, 1975?
2. Whether the workwoman abandoned her job w.e.f. 12th March, 1975 while receiving payment in full and final settlement of all her claims?
3. In case of non proof of issues No. 1 and 2, whether the termination of services of the workwoman was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?

Shri Davinder Kumar Jain, sole proprietor of the management concerned appearing as MW-1, deposed with reference to the register of attendance of his employees brought by him in Court, that the workwoman concerned was employed on temporary basis on 1st January, 1975 on wages of Rs 70 or Rs 80 P.M. and that she abandoned her job on 13th March, 1975 by absenting herself from duties on that date and on 14th March, 1975 and 15th March, 1975. He added that she received Rs 30. 96 on 31st March, 1975 from him in full and final settlement of her wages of 12 days of March, 1975,—*vide* voucher Ex. M-1.

The workwoman stoutly rebutted the statement of Shri Davinder Kumar Jain while stating that she served the management concerned for full one year for the period ending 8th May, 1975 and that she worked for 12 hours every day during this period. She added that the management did not pay her wages of two months and the overtime work out in by her and that they on the other hand illegally terminated her services on the evening of 8th May, 1975. This is all the evidence led by the parties in support of their pleas.

Neither any appointment letter was admittedly issued in respect of the employment of Shrimati Kalawati nor did she make any application for that purpose. The solitary oral statement of Shri Davinder Kumar Jain that She was employed on temporary basis and that she herself abandoned her job on 12th March, 1975 is thus hardly sufficient to prove the pleas of the management covered by issues No. 1 and 2 particularly when this is found rebutted by the statement of the later herself. The voucher Ex. M-1 alleged to have been thumb marked by Smt. Kalawati was admittedly brought on record for the first time on 17 January, 1977 when Shri Davinder Kumar Jain appeared as his own witness and that it was admittedly not relied upon earlier and did not see the light the day before that date even though the management filed their written statement as far back as on 17th July, 1976. Smt. Kalawati denied her thumb impression on this voucher and objected to its admissibility at late stage. The management did not make any effort to get her thumb impression allegedly appearing at mark A. on this voucher, compared with her specimen or proved thumb impression. The bare oral statement of Shri Davinder-Kumar Jain that voucher Ex. M-1 relating to the payment of wages of Rs 30.96 to the workwoman, was thumb marked by her, does not inspire any confidence and is not sufficient to prove this payment to her in full and final satisfaction of her dues. I am thus not prepared to rely on his statement made by him in proof of the pleas covered by issues No. 1 and 2.

One cannot make but any reasons for the workwoman having abandoned her job voluntarily. The explanation put forth by the management that she had two children and had to look after them and as such she thought necessary to abandon her job, was countered by the workwoman herself with a statement that her child of the age of 10 years took care of herself and looked after her younger brother. The mere circumstance that the workwoman had two minor children would not justify the conclusion that she stood in the need and necessity of her resigning the job. The half hearted plea of the management that it was a case of discharge simplicitor, even if it be assumed that her services were terminated, in absence of an iota of evidence or even a suggestion on this point in the statement of Shri Davinder Kumar Jain leads to an inference beyond doubt that the whole case put forth by the management is false and fabricated and it cannot be imagined that the workwoman would abandoned her job herself without valid reasons. Even the attendance register relied on by Shri Davinder Kumar Jain in his statement was not brought on record at the earliest stage and cannot thus be said to be reliable. The mere circumstance that it was checked by the Factory Inspector on 26th July, 1974 does not render it an authentic document for purposes of this case.

I, thus for the reasons stated above while placing no reliance on the statement of Shri Davinder Kumar Jain fully rely on the evidence of Smt. Kalawati, workwoman and decide all the three issues against the management with the result that she become entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages. I hold accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

Dated the 21st September, 1977,

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour, Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 2033, dated the 26th September, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 10540-4Lab-77/27279.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Somany Pilkington's Ltd., Kassar, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Application No. 15 of 1977 under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

between

SHRI MAHABIR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SOMANY PILKINGTON'S LTD., KASSAR, BAHADURGARH

Present :

Shri Rajinder Singh Dahyia, for the workman.
Shri Sudhir Chadha, for the management.

AWARD

On receipt of the complaint, notice was issued to the respondent. The respondent appeared and filed written statement. The case was fixed for filing rejoinder by the complainant. Today the representative for the complainant appeared and withdrew the complaint stating that he would take step to raise a regular dispute. The complaint is, therefore, dismissed as withdrawn. The parties to bear their own costs.

Dated the 15th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 938, dated the 27th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1977.

Dated the 27th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 10538-4Lab-77/27283.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Association Engineering Industries, 17/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 29 of 1974

between

SHRI RAM BAKS, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ASSOCIATION ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES, 17/3, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD.

Present :

Shri Madhu Sudan Saran Cowshish and Shri Amar Singh for the workman.

Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/73/5642, dated 5th March, 1974, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Associated Engineering Industries, 17/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Ram Baks, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d), sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Baks was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared through their representatives. The management had examined one witness Shri Jag Ram Sharma their manager and Shri Vijay Batra, the Proprietor as M. W. 1 and M. W. 2. They further examined Shri A. R. Handa as M. W. 3 and closed their case. The workman examined himself as W. W. 1 and closed the case. The case was then fixed for arguments. Thereafter on a date fixed for arguments on 25th August, 1976, the management did not appear and my learned predecessor after hearing the arguments *ex parte* for the workman found that the enquiry were vitiated and issued notices to the parties to appear for further proceedings in the matter. Thereafter the management moved application for setting aside *ex parte* order of my learned predecessor. This application was again dismissed on 7th April, 1977 for default of appearance on the part of the management. But thereafter at 1.00 P.M. the representative of the management appeared and then the representative for the workman was called. He stated that if the order of 7th April, 1977 was set aside, he had no objection. Therefore, that order was set aside and the application for setting aside the *ex parte* order of my learned predecessor, dated 6th September, 1976 was restored and issues were framed on that day. The issues are given hereunder:—

- (1) Whether there are sufficient ground for setting aside the *ex parte* impugned order, dated 6th September, 1976 ?
- (2) Whether the application of the management for setting aside the *ex parte*/order, dated 6th September, 1976 is within time ?

The case was set for the evidence of the parties on 23rd May, 1977. On 23rd May, 1977 the representative for the workman stated that a compromise had taken place and in view of that compromise, he withdrew from the reference and also withdraw the dispute. I, therefore, give my award as follows:—

"That there is no dispute between the parties. The matter had already been settled between them."

Dated the 7th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 942, dated the 27th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 27th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 10546-4Lab-77/27287.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Somany Pilkington's Ltd., Kassar, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Application No. 7 of 1977 under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
between

SHRI RAM PARAS BHAGAT, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
M/S SOMANY PILKINGTON'S LTD., KASSAR, BAHADURGARH

Present :

Shri Rajinder Singh Dahyia, for the workman.
Shri Sudhir Chadha, for the management.

AWARD

On receipt of the complaint, notice was issued to the respondent. The respondent appeared and filed written statement. The case was fixed for filing rejoinder by the complainant. Today the representative for the complainant appeared and withdrew the complaint stating that he would take step to raise a regular dispute. The complaint is, therefore, dismissed as withdrawn. The parties to bear their own costs.

The 15th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 931, dated 27th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

The 27th September, 1977.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 10544-4Lab-77/27359.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Somany Pilkington's Limited, Kassar, Bahadurgarh.

**BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Application No. 13 of 1977 under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

between

**SHRI RAM DHAYAN RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SOMANY
PILKINGTON'S LIMITED, KASSAR, BAHADURGARH**

Present : —

Shri Rajinder Singh Dahyia, for the workman.

Shri Sudhir Chadha for the management.

AWARD

On receipt of the complaint, notices were issued to the respondent. The respondent appeared and filed written statements. The cases was fixed for filing rejoinder by the complainant. Today the representative for the complainant appeared and withdrew the complaint stating that he would take step to raise a regular dispute. The complaint is, therefore, dismissed as withdrawn. The parties to bear their own cost.

Dated, the 15th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 933, dated the 27th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 27th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.